## (EXCERPT AS FOLLOWS: THE COURT: Mr. Goldstein for the defendant. 2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor. May I have a 3 4 moment, your Honor, just to --5 THE COURT: Yes, you may. 6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: You're going to have to turn that, Mr. Goldstein, so I can see you as well. Put it up and then 8 9 we'll --10:05 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: All right. I just need to 11 apparently --12 THE COURT: Just turn it this way -- the other way. That's it. 13 14 MR. GOLDSTEIN: How's that? 1.5 THE COURT: That's good. 16 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I have one more, your Honor. 17 Robert George has committed no crime. That is what the evidence will show. Let me say that again. Robert George, 18 19 a prominent Boston lawyer and zealous advocate, who has spent a 10:06 20 career challenging this government in highly-charged, 21 vigorously-contested proceedings, stands accused of crimes he 22 simply did not commit. By the end of this case, that narrative 23 told you by Mr. Hafer that Mr. George orchestrated or hatched 24 this conspiracy or that this case began with some random or 25 chance encounter at the South Shore Plaza will be rendered

10:08 20

10:07 10

entirely implausible. And the evidence will show that the government's case is poisoned at its essence, built on a toxic foundation of lies carefully crafted by Ron Dardinski, a person, the evidence will show, cannot be trusted on any level and particularly cannot be trusted when it comes to his former lawyer, Mr. George.

Now, it's undisputed that on two occasions, December 16, 2009, and April 15, 2010, Ron Dardinski, the government's informant, gave cash to Michael Hansen, each time in return for a check in the amount of \$80,000. But it's also undisputed that Mr. George was not present and did not physically participate in either one of the two charged transactions. In fact, on December 7, 2009, as Mr. Hafer calls it, in his own words and in a conversation Mr. Hafer conveniently failed to discuss with you during his opening, this is what Mr. George told Ron Dardinski in his own words.

(Audiotape played.)

MR. GOLDSTEIN: These excerpts from a longer conversation on December 7, 2009, only nine days before the first charged transaction, eloquently capture Mr. George's state of mind on that date. And the evidence will show his state of mind never changed, not on June 1, 2010, more than a year after the government began its investigation, when Mr. George, yet again, rejected Dardinski's overtures, telling him the only way he could help Mr. George is to refer him clients.

(Audiotape played.)

1.5

10:10 20

10:10 10

MR. GOLDSTEIN: And his state of mind didn't change in February of 2011, a month before his arrest and almost two years after the government first began secretly tape-recording his conversations when Mr. George, yet again, rejected Dardinski's desperate attempts to manufacture a criminal money laundering conspiracy from whole cloth, telling Dardinski for the umpteenth time that he would not be involved in his cash transactions.

(Audiotape played.)

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Why is Mr. George here? We may never know the real reason or reasons. But in the end, whatever Mr. Hansen did or did not do with Ron Dardinski, the evidence will be, as I told you at the outset, Mr. George has committed no crime.

May it please the Court, counsel, and ladies and gentlemen of the jury, as you now know, my name is Robert Goldstein, and with Mr. Reddington, I am proud to represent Robert George in this matter.

The evidence will show this case did not begin with any random or chance encounter at the South Shore Plaza in February or March of 2009. Incredibly, the government, to date, has not even identified the date of this alleged critical meeting. But the evidence will show that it began well before then. You will learn that on January 21, 2009, only days after

10:12 20

10:11 10

he was released from prison on Martha's Vineyard, Ron Dardinski began telephoning Mr. George's law office, telling his secretary that he just got out of jail and needed to see Mr. George. The evidence will show that from February 5 to February 17, 2009, Mr. Dardinski called Mr. George's law office at least an additional seven times without making any contact or receiving a return call from Mr. George. Why was Dardinski so intent on getting in touch with Mr. George immediately upon his release from prison? Listen carefully to the evidence in this case, in particular, the cross-examinations of the government's witnesses, and those reasons will be laid bare.

By February of 2009, Mr. Dardinski had become a professional informant. The evidence will show that by that time he had been paid more than \$75,000 by government agents in return for his cooperation in other cases. The evidence will show that he has since been paid more than \$20,000 for his role in this investigation and that he stands to be paid still more for his cooperation in this matter.

While Ron Dardinski has convinced the government to buy his lies, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you will not be required to accept the lies and deception of Ron Dardinski, a man, the evidence will show, has lived a lifetime of deception. You will learn that on repeated occasions Dardinski has been convicted for crimes of deceit. You will learn that for his entire life Ron Dardinski has honed and perfected his art of

2.1

10:14 20

10:13 10

deception, manipulating circumstances to make it appear as if a set of facts exist when they do not. You will learn Mr.

Dardinski has deceived dozens of honest citizens of this

Commonwealth, robbing them of their hard-earned money by

looking them in the eye, as he will do here in this courtroom,

and telling a story built on a foundation of lies.

Not only has Mr. Dardinski been convicted on dozens of occasions for crimes of deceit, he has committed crimes while ostensibly cooperating with government agents in violation of his cooperation agreement. He has been imprisoned and then, yet again, engaged in crimes of deceit. The evidence will show Mr. Dardinski is simply incapable of changing. It is who he is down to his molecular DNA. The evidence will show that there is not a situation in which he will not lie and not a person to whom he will not lie, particularly if it's in his own interest to do so. And the evidence will show that it was and is entirely in his interest to lie about Mr. George.

Incredibly, you will hear the agents ostensibly responsible for Mr. Dardinski's cooperation knew all about his history of deception, yet they continued to use him as a cooperator. At least the FBI has demonstrated the wisdom to cut Dardinski off as a cooperator, not the DEA, not DEA Agent Joseph Tamuleviz. Rather than cut ties with Mr. Dardinski, the evidence will show that Agent Tamuleviz and his team have continued to handsomely reward him for his cooperation. I

10:16 20

10:15 10

expect the evidence to show that Dardinski's marriage to Agent Tamuleviz has proven to be not only very lucrative but, ultimately, a powerfully corrupting incentive for Mr. Dardinski to create the appearance of crime where none exists.

In the end, I expect Ron Dardinski to tell you in his own words that he has absolutely no place, no place, as a witness in a criminal proceeding. I expect he will admit that not because he wants to but because he has to. So I ask you to keep an open mind during Mr. Dardinski's direct examination testimony. In the end, his motives and intentions will be crystal clear, and the evidence will show he not only has the ability to create the appearance of crime where none exists, but that is precisely what he has done here.

Now, Mr. Hafer and I agree on at least one thing: The recordings in this case will be of paramount importance, perhaps even more important than the government now realizes. But to discern the true, real course of events requires a careful, almost forensic, examination of the recordings, not some superficial playing of the tapes but almost a forensic examination of the recordings. So together, throughout the course of this trial, we will navigate and deconstruct the pertinent recordings and meetings.

And I expect that examination will reveal several immutable facts. First, Mr. George repeatedly rejected Dardinski's efforts to get him to launder criminal funds

beginning with the very first recorded conversation on March 18, 2009, when Mr. George told Dardinski that he obviously would not be involved in any transaction involving drug proceeds. As you heard, nine months later, on December 7, 2009, Mr. George told Dardinski, no less than 14 times, he would not be involved in Dardinski's transactions with Hansen. And you will learn Mr. George continued to reject those overtures all the way through to February 2011.

Second, the recordings will demonstrate Mr. George had no actual knowledge that Dardinski and Hansen were even engaging in financial transactions, much less knowledge regarding the purpose, structure or details of those transactions. In fact, the recordings after April 15, 2010, the date of the charged transaction, I expect will show Mr. George repeatedly questioning Dardinski and Hansen whether they actually engaged in any transactions. For example, on April 27, 2010, 12 days after the second of two charged transactions, you will hear Mr. George actually ask Dardinski to swear on his kids' lives that he was even doing deals with Mr. Hansen. (Audiotape played.)

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. George's absence of knowledge that Hansen and Dardinski were even engaging in financial transactions, I expect, will be a recurring theme throughout these recordings.

Third, after Mr. George told Dardinski in the very

10:17 10

10:18 20

1.5

10:20 20

10:19 10

first conversation in March of 2009 that he would not be involved in any transaction involving drug proceeds, you will learn Ron Dardinski never again mentioned drugs or drug proceeds in any conversation with Mr. George that predates April 15, 2010, the date of the second charged transaction. Did Dardinski later, after April 15th, mention drugs or drug proceeds in conversations with Mr. George? Yes. But never again between April 15, 2010, and March 18 of 2009. And the recordings will demonstrate Mr. George simply had no intent to launder criminal proceeds.

In fact, the evidence will show Mr. George had ample reason to believe Ron Dardinski would have legitimate earnings that he would want converted into a check. The evidence will show -- you'll hear many recordings regarding the fact Ron Dardinski at one point in time owned and operated a very large automobile repossession business which had approximately 300 different banks as customers. And the evidence will show Mr. George had every reason to believe Mr. Dardinski would not want to publicly expose his legitimately earned money, including the fact that when Mr. Dardinski was released from prison in January of 2009, there was an outstanding order from a court for back-owed child support obligations exceeding \$50,000 and court-ordered restitution obligations of tens of thousands of dollars.

Now, while we agree the recordings will be important

10:21 20

10:21 10

in this case, that's not where the story ends. In addition to the content of the recordings, it's not just the content but the timing of the recordings that will be critically important in this case. For example, as you will learn, after two recordings of substance in the spring of 2009 -- March 18 and April 6, 2009 -- there are only two recorded calls with Mr. George for the entire following year, between April 6, 2009, and April 25 of 2010.

I expect you'll hear evidence of a conversation on August 14, 2009, when Mr. Dardinski simply reports back to Mr. George regarding the results of a meeting he had with Mr. Hansen on that date, and the conversation on December 7, 2009, when Mr. George told Dardinski, no less than 14 times, he would not be involved in his transactions.

Importantly, the government will not offer a single recorded call of Mr. George between December 7, 2009, and April 15, 2010, the date of the second transaction, meaning you will not hear a single recording wherein Mr. George alters the message he delivered so unequivocally to Mr. Dardinski during the December 7th telephone conversation.

Additionally, you will learn it's not just the content of the recordings or the timing of the recordings but the absence of calls and the absence of communications that will be critically important to understanding the true, real course of events in this case. For example, I expect the evidence to be

10:23 20

10:22 10

overwhelming that Mr. George stopped talking to Michael Hansen in April of 2009 and that they did not begin speaking again until July of 2010, more than a year later and only after Mr. Hansen had agreed to cooperate with the government. Some conspiracy, ladies and gentlemen. The government has charged that Mr. George conspired with Michael Hansen from February of 2009 to June of 2010, and the evidence will demonstrate Mr. George was not even on speaking terms with the only other person charged as a coconspirator for almost that entire period of time.

Now, the Honorable Judge Gorton is the only authority on the law in this case. But I expect he will instruct you that, as a matter of law, a conspiracy in this case cannot include Mr. Dardinski because he was, at all pertinent times, acting as a government agent.

The evidence will also show there were large swarths of time when Mr. Dardinski simply fell off the grid and stopped calling Mr. George. For example, the evidence will show that between September 4, 2009, and December 6, 2009, Mr. Dardinski calls Mr. George zero times, a period of slightly more than three months, 92 days, not a single call from Dardinski to George. Likewise, from January 11, 2010, to April 26, 2010, the evidence will show Dardinski called Mr. George zero times.

What does Mr. George, this money-hungry, money-laundering, lawyer do to further his alleged intent to

10:25 20

10:24 10

engage in criminal money laundering? To further his alleged conspiracy when Dardinski stops calling him? The evidence will show: nothing, not a single thing. The evidence will show Mr. George did not contact or call Mr. Dardinski even a single time when Dardinski stopped calling him between September 4th and December 6th and did not call him a single time between January 11 and April 26, 2010, and only then in response to calls from Dardinski to Mr. George. How do we know? You will examine with us certain toll records of their respective telephones. In the end, it's not just the content of the recordings, but we'll also examine relevant toll records, and they, too, will help demonstrate the poisoned foundation of the government's case.

Finally, in addition to the content of the calls, the timing of the calls, and the absence of calls, we will examine certain call patterns in this case, and they will demonstrate, contrary to what Mr. Hafer tried to tell you a few minutes ago, that it was Ron Dardinski that was the engine pushing this entire orchestration, that if not for Dardinski, the professional informant, pushing his agenda, there would have been no transactions in this case, none at all.

You will learn that Mr. Dardinski engaged in numerous predatory calling campaigns, that he would essentially force his way into conversations and meetings, including his first meeting with Mr. Hansen on August 14, 2009, when, the evidence

1.5

10:26 20

10:26 10

will show, Dardinski simply threatened to show up unannounced at Hansen's place of business if Michael Hansen would not return his calls.

Now, as Mr. Hafer tried to explain, we will not hear the overwhelming majority of calls made to Mr. George or Mr. Hansen in this case by Ronald Dardinski because Mr. Dardinski selectively recorded very few of the conversations that he had in this case even though I expect the evidence to show government agents had the ability to tape-record and preserve every single call made during their two-plus-year investigation if they so desired. But we do have the toll records, and an examination of those toll records will also help expose the toxic foundation of the government's case.

Now, this is just the tip of the proverbial iceberg as to the evidence we expect to elicit from the recordings and toll records in this case. Does Mr. George sound less professional than he would want to? Does he say some dumb things during the course of the recordings? Of course, he does, as would most anyone if you were secretly tape-recorded for more than two years of your life. The evidence will show that Mr. George was simply trying to appease what he thought to be an existing client, Ron Dardinski, and to connect with what he believed to be a potential new client, an undercover officer.

But in the end, the recordings and toll records will

10:28 20

10:27 10

demonstrate overwhelmingly that Michael Hansen and Ron Dardinski formed their own independent relationship, completely divorced from Mr. George, and the government cannot and will not prove that Mr. George conspired with Michael Hansen in February of 2009, June of 2010, or any time in between.

In fact, as I noted, government agents eventually decided to confront Michael Hansen. I expect the evidence to show that on June 8, 2010, government agents appeared unannounced at Mr. Hansen's home. I expect the evidence to show that by June 10 of 2010 -- I expect the evidence to show that by June 10 of 2010, Michael Hansen had entered into a cooperation agreement with the government. Over the course of the next month to six weeks, the government agents debriefed Michael Hansen, getting his view of events from February of 2009 to June of 2010, his view of Dardinski, and his view of his interactions with Dardinski.

Now, you may have noticed Mr. Hafer did not list Michael Hansen as one of the people he expected you might hear from in this case. It's not yet known whether or not the government will call Michael Hansen as a witness. They've informed the Court that they do not presently intend to call him. But we expect that, if called, Michael Hansen will testify that he never entered into a conspiracy to launder criminally derived funds with Mr. George and that Mr. George never told him that Dardinski's money came from drug proceeds.

10:30 20

10:29 10

That's right, ladies and gentlemen. The one person charged in this case as a coconspirator, who at this very moment in time is subject to a cooperation agreement with the U.S. attorneys, I expect will testify, if called, that he never entered into an agreement with Robert George to launder criminally derived funds.

Now, after debriefing Mr. Hansen for a month or so, government agents had him reinitiate contact with Mr. George. As you'll recall, the evidence will establish Mr. George had not spoken to Michael Hansen since April of 2009. And Mr. Hansen eventually records a series of conversations and meetings in the fall of 2010. Yes, Michael Hansen eventually gives Mr. George a check in the amount of \$20,000 and later replaces that check with \$20,000 in cash. But the evidence will show that that occurred in August of 2010 and September of 2010, four and five months after the second charged transaction and well after Mr. Hansen agreed to cooperate with the government.

I expect the recordings to demonstrate Mr. George never asked for, expected or wanted even a penny of the money that Hansen may have taken from Dardinski. And Mr. Hafer's descriptions of those conversations in April and May of 2010, for the government to suggest that Mr. George was trying to physically scare Michael Hansen to reinitiate contact with him so that he could get paid will once again be rendered entirely

10:32 20

10:31 10

implausible. I also expect the recordings to show how strange Mr. George found it that Michael Hansen was chasing him to give him money.

In the end, a thorough examination of the recordings between Mr. George and Michael Hansen will demonstrate that there was no preexisting agreement between Mr. George and Michael Hansen to split any proceeds that Hansen may have taken from Dardinski. And any suggestion to the contrary by the government will be exposed for precisely what it is: yet another allegation manufactured from whole cloth.

Now, in January of 2011, after almost two years of Dardinski chasing Mr. George and after turning an old friend into a cooperating witness, government agents implemented a new effort to ensnare Mr. George. Picking up on his comment on June 1, 2010, as you heard, Mr. George telling Dardinski the only way he could help him was by referring him clients, government agents had Dardinski tell Mr. George he had a potential new, big-money client for him. There are two meetings with an undercover officer in 2011 -- well, we've got a technical glitch. There are two meetings with an undercover officer, February 28, 2011, and March 4, 2011, who Mr. George believes is a potential new client. And the undercover agent does eventually give Mr. George \$25,000 in cash as a legal retainer.

The evidence will show Mr. George was open and

10:34 20

10:33 10

transparent in his representation and dealings with the undercover officer. If the hallmark of criminal conduct is secrecy, clandestine meetings, and hidden evidence, the evidence will show Mr. George meeting in public places with the undercover officer, in a restaurant, in a lobby of a hotel in Dedham, having public conversations and asking the undercover officer to sign an engagement agreement.

Now, an important point, ladies and gentlemen, the government does not charge Mr. George has done anything unlawful by accepting the \$25,000 as a legal fee in this case. It is perhaps distasteful to some, but the fact of the matter is that every citizen is entitled to legal representation, even a person engaged in despicable conduct such as drug distribution. The Sixth Amendment of the United States

Constitution demands no less. And so the government has not charged that Mr. George has done anything unlawful by accepting the undercover officer as a client or accepting his \$25,000 as a legal fee.

Instead, as you heard, the government charges that Mr. George illegally structured the deposit of that money, making two deposits in amounts less than \$10,000, one -- both deposits into the same Bank of America account but at different branches located approximately a mile or so away from each other and making those deposits within minutes of each other. Counts 4, 5, and 7 charge that Mr. George illegally structured those

10:35 20

10:35 10

transactions to avoid certain reporting requirements imposed upon our financial banking institutions. In the end, the evidence will be clear: Mr. George did not have any intent to evade any reporting requirements. In fact, as Mr. Hafer told you, Bank of America actually issued the Currency Transaction Report the government alleges Mr. George had an intent to evade.

Count 6, which we've not yet discussed, concerns a check in the amount of \$2,500 that Mr. George gave to Mr. Dardinski after receiving the \$25,000 from the undercover officer, representing a 10 percent referral fee for what Mr. George believed to be a new client. In the end, for reasons that will become clear during trial, the government cannot and will not prove that count either.

Now, faced with a factual void regarding Mr. George's actual conduct, the evidence will show the government has engaged in an invasive examination of his finances, going so far as to subpoena his wife's credit card statements, her car payment history, and even his children's college and postgraduate academic and loan records, all in an effort to try to show Mr. George was laboring under some financial pressure, all in an attempt to explain how or why Mr. George in life would ever offer to launder funds for Mr. Dardinski.

In the end, the evidence will show Mr. George was, by all accounts, a well-accomplished, well-paid lawyer, with

2.1

10:37 20

10:36 10

substantial assets and significant earning power when government agents, approximately ten of them, surrounded and stormed his home in the early morning hours of March 23, 2011.

Mr. George, a devoted family man, at home with his wife and daughter, getting ready for the day ahead, was so stunned, you will hear, that he actually fainted when he realized government agents were in his home accusing him of criminal conduct.

Now, this is a criminal case. As the Court has instructed you, in a criminal case, a defendant bears absolutely no burden of proof. The Constitution upon which this country was built unequivocally provides Mr. George the right to sit here silent. It is the government that bears the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt each and every element of each charged crime. It is a gravely solemn burden of proof that requires not speculation, assumption or guesswork or even the possibility or probability that a crime occurred but only proof beyond a reasonable doubt, evidence so convincing and compelling that you would rely on it in making gravely serious decisions upon which your fate or your family's fate would depend.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is no greater horror in a democracy than to be wrongfully charged by your government.

Our criminal justice system has you as its foundation, the framers of the Constitution. The Founding Fathers feared the centralization of excessive power in its government. That is

why an accusation is not the same as a conviction. That is why a prosecutor does not decide whether to extinguish a citizen's liberty or instead to liberate that person from false charges. That is a power so compelling that in our system of justice it's reserved for 12 people, not one or two, a jury of a citizen's ultimate protection against the excesses of his government.

In the end, I respectfully submit to you the government will fail to sustain its gravely solemn burden of proof. Mr. George surely permitted Ron Dardinski to remain in his life for too long, but there simply will be no sustainable foundation to the government's case. When we stand before you for closing arguments, we will, therefore, respectfully ask that you return a verdict of not guilty on each and every count, not out of sympathy or passion but because it will be right, just and proper, because Mr. George is innocent of these wholly unjust and unfounded accusations. Thank you.

. . END OF EXCERPT.)

10:38 10

2-21

## 

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my skill and ability.

## /s/Cheryl Dahlstrom

06/05/2012

Cheryl Dahlstrom, RMR, CRR Dated

Official Court Reporter